

Appl. No. 10/672,143
Amdt. Date Sep. 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

REMARKS

Regarding Drawings objections

The drawings are objected to because Examiner states that they fail to show "the receiving channel extends horizontally through one of the sidewalls" as described in the specification. In fact, Applicants recite that the IC socket includes a vertical fastening channel and a horizontal receiving channel. The fastening channel extends in a vertical direction as shown in FIGS. 1-5. The receiving channel is perpendicular to the fastening channel, so, the receiving channel apparently extends in a horizontal direction, as shown in FIGS. 1-5.

A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made understands that the sensor must touch or be close to the IC carried on the IC socket. The housing of the IC socket must provide the sensor with a path to touch or be close to the IC. Therefore, the receiving channel is obviously through the sidewall of the housing, as known by the person having ordinary skill in the art.

Claim rejections

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen et al. (US 4,422,703) in view of Eckert (US 5,630,735).

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen et al. in view of Eckert and Johnson et al. (US 6,744,269).

Rejections of claim 1 and claim 5 are traversed

Examiner in the office action rejected independent claim 1 and claim 5 on Christensen et al. in view of Eckert under U.S.C. 103(a). Examiner states that Christensen et al. disclose the present invention except for the at least one sidewall of the housing forms a receiving channel and a fastening channel communicating with the receiving channel, the bolt is screwed in the fastening channel. Further, Examiner adds that Eckert discloses a connector

Appl. No. 10/672,143
Amdt. Date Sep. 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

assembly having a housing defining a fastening channel and a receiving channel.

In response, Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner reconsider the rejections for the following reasons:

It's well known that in order for any prior art references themselves to be validly combined for use in a prior art § 103 rejection, the references themselves must suggest that they be combined. For example, as was stated in In re Sernaker, 217 U.S.P.Q. 1, 6 (C.A.F.C. 1983):

"Prior art references in combination do not make an invention obvious unless something in the prior art references would suggest the advantage to be derived from combining their teachings."

In the present case, there is no reason given in this office action to support the proposed combination, and neither of the references shows objective teaching that would have lead an individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references.

The present invention directs to a connector having a fastening mechanism for easily and conveniently attaching a sensor thereto.

Christensen et al. address the major object is to "provide a simplified connector for interconnecting a multi-pin array to corresponding socket. And Eckert addresses the major object is to "provide a device in which the coupling of two or more electrical conductors may be easily and quickly performed." The references make no mention of the fastening channel communicating with a receiving channel.

Examiner states that Eckert discloses a connector forming at least one receiving channel 8 and a fastening channel 14 communicating with the receiving channel, at least one bolt 16 is screwed in the fastening channel. In fact, the alleged fastening channel 14 is central crimp, not a channel.

FIG. 1 of Eckert shows two types of channels including a longitudinal

Appl. No. 10/672,143
Amdt. Date Sep. 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

bore 8 and a transverse bore 18. However, the bores are not communicating with each other. And, the bolt 16 cannot fasten anything received in the longitudinal bore 8.

Therefore, even if the Christensen et al. and the Eckert references are combined in an improper manner, the combination does not disclose all the novel features claimed in claim 1 and claim 5 of the present invention.

The fastening channel communicating with the receiving channel of the present invention is to receive a bolt therein for apply force on a sensor received in the receiving channel. Both of the cited references cannot achieve this purpose.

In summary, Applicants submit that combining Christensen et al. and Eckert is not justified and is therefore improper. The rejections based on these references are improper and should be withdrawn.

Depend claims 2-4 and claims 6-8 incorporate all the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 5, respectively, and add respective additional subject matter. As detailed above, it is asserted that claims 1 and 5 are allowable. Thus, it is submitted that said dependent claims are also allowable, and Applicants request that the rejections relating thereto be removed.

Rejection of claim 9 is traversed

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Christensen et al. in view of Eckert and Johnson et al.

Firstly, Johnson et al. is issued on June 1, 2004. The issue date is later than the filing date of the present invention. So, Johnson is not a prior art to the present invention. Therefore, Johnson cannot be a prior art used in the 103(a) rejection.

Secondly, Christensen et al. and Eckert cannot be combined, as explained above. Even if Christensen et al. and Eckert are combined in improper manner,

Appl. No. 10/672,143
Amdt. Date Sep. 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

the combination does not disclose all the novel features claimed in claim 9.
The novel features includes:

- (1) a receiving channel formed in the housing to communicate the cavity with an exterior;
- (2) a detecting device received in the receiving channel with a wire connected to an external device located in the exterior.

The novel features claimed in claim 9 enables easily and conveniently attaching a sensor or detecting device to a connector, which cannot be achieved by Christensen et al. and Eckert.

In summary, Applicants submit that combining Christensen et al. and Eckert is not justified and is therefore improper. The rejections based on these references are improper and should be withdrawn.

Depend claims 10-14 incorporate all the subject matter of independent claim 9, and add respective additional subject matter. As detailed above, it is asserted that claim 9 is allowable. Thus, it is submitted that said dependent claims are also allowable, and Applicants request that the rejection relating thereto be removed.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants assert that all the pending claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior arts. Therefore Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, and that an action to this effect is earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,
McHugh et al.

By 

Wei Te Chung

Appl. No. 10/672,143
Amdt. Date Sep. 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2005

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P. O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (408) 919-6137